



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/719,318

11/21/2003

Patrick Vanderwilt

199-0082US-C

3084

29855

7590

01/17/2006

WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI,

P.C.

20333 SH 249

SUITE 600

HOUSTON, TX 77070

EXAMINER

RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 01/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/719,318	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VANDERWILT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Melur Ramakrishnaiah	<b>Art Unit</b> 2643	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                                              | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11-21-03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-4, 7-13, 16-19, and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig et al. (US PAT: 5,617,539, hereinafter Ludwig) in view of Venkataraman et al. (US PAT: 5,956,487, hereinafter Venkataraman).

Regarding claim 2, Ludwig discloses a video conferencing system as shown in figure 1 comprising a personal computer (12), i.e., a videoconferencing unit, for processing and transmitting audio and video data to a plurality of users of the system through a network interface (110, figures 18A-18B and col. 15 lines 56-63). Ludwig differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching a web server embedded within the personal computer and coupled to the network interface for transmitting a web page in response to a requests from a user, wherein the web page allows the user to select a file for broadcast to the videoconferencing unit or allows the user to view a file being transmitted by the video conferencing unit. However, Venkataraman teaches a device (10, figure 1) having an embedded web access functionality including web server (14, figure 1) embedded within the device and coupled to a network including web server (14, figure 1) embedded within the device and coupled to a network interface (12, figure 1) for transmitting a web page in response to HTTP commands from a web client, i.e., a user, wherein the web page

Art Unit: 2643

allows the user to select a file for broadcasting to the device or allow the user to view the file being transmitted by the device in order to provide widely accessible and enhanced user interface functions for the device (col. 3 line 5 through col. 4 line 16 and col. 4 lines 29-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ludwig in having the web server embedded within the personal computer and coupled to the network interface for transmitting the web page in response to the requests from the user, wherein the web page allows the user to select the file for broadcast to the videoconferencing unit or allows the user to view the file being transmitted by the video conferencing unit, as per teaching of Venkatmman, because it provide widely accessible and enhanced user interface functions for the device.

Regarding claim 3, Venkatraman teaches the web page allows the network manager to select a file for broadcast to the managed workstation and to view a file being transmitted by the managed workstation (col. 3 lines 17-26).

Regarding claim 4, Venkatraman teaches the web Page may Contain text, images, multimedia files, forms, tables or any object type (col. 3 lines 40-42) so that one skill in the art would recognize the file comprising a presentation.

Regarding claim 7, Verkatraman teaches the web pages further allowing the web client to perform diagnostic testing on the managed workstation (col. 3 lines 17-26 and lines 34-36).

Regarding claim 8, Venkatrman teaches the web page further allowing the web client to upgrade, i.e., to modify configuration parameters, of the device (col. 10 lines 47-60).

Regarding claim 9, Ludwig discloses a video conferencing system as shown in figure 1 comprising a personal computer (12), i.e., a videoconferencing unit, for processing and of users of the system through a network transmitting audio and video data to a plurality interface (110, figures 18A-18B and col. 15 lines 56-63). Ludwig differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching a web server embedded within the personal computer and coupled to the network interface for transmitting a web page in response to a requests from a user, wherein the web page allows the user to perform diagnostic testing on the videoconferencing unit. However, Venkatraman teaches a device (10, figure 1) having an embedded server (14, figure 1) being programmed to function web access functionality for transmitting a web page in response to a request from a web client, i.e., a user, wherein the webpage allows the web client to perform diagnostic testing on the device in order to provide widely accessible and enhanced user interface functions for the device (col. 3 line 5 through col. 4 line16 and col. 4 lines 29-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ludwig in having the web server embedded within the personal computer and coupled to the network interface for transmitting a web page in response to a requests from a user, wherein the web page allows the user to perform diagnostic testing on the videoconferencing limit,

as per teaching of Venkatraman, because it provide widely accessible and enhanced user interface functions for the device.

Regarding claim 10, Ludwig discloses a video conferencing system as shown in figure 1 comprising a personal computer (12), i.e., a videoconferencing unit, for processing and transmitting audio and video data to a plurality of users of the system through a network interface (110, figures 18A-18B and col. 15 lines 56-63). Ludwig differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching a web server embedded within the personal computer and coupled to the network interface for transmitting a web page in response to a requests from a user, wherein the web page allows the user to modify configuration parameters of the videoconferencing unit. However, Venkatrâman teaches a device (10, figure 1) having an embedded web access functionality including web server (14, figure 1) embedded within the device and coupled to a network interface (12, figure 1) for transmitting a web page in response to HTTP commands from a web client, i.e., a user, wherein the web page allows the user to select a file for broadcasting to the device or allow the user to view the file being transmitted by the device in order to provide widely accessible and enhanced user interface functions for the device (col. 3 line 5 through col. 4 line 16 and col. 4 lines 29-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ludwig in having the web server embedded within the personal computer and coupled to the network interface for transmitting a web page in response to a requests from a user, wherein the web page allows the user

Art Unit: 2643

to modify configuration parameters of the videoconferencing unit, as per teaching of Venkatraman, because it provide widely accessible and enhanced user interface functions for the device.

Regarding claim 11, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 2.

Regarding claim 12, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 3.

Regarding claim 13, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 4.

Regarding claim 16, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 7.

Regarding claim 17, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 8.

Regarding claim 18, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 2.

Regarding claim 19, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 4.

Regarding claim 22, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the snme reasons set forth in claim 7.

Regarding claim 23, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the snme reasons set forth in claim 8.

Regarding claim 24, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 9.

Regarding claim 25, the limitations of the claim are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claim 10.

3. Claims 5-6, 14-15, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludwig in view of Venkataraman as applied to claims above, and further in view of Criag (US PAT: 6,108,687).

Regarding claims 5-6, the combination of Ludwig and Venkatraman differs from the claimed invention in not specifically teaching the presentation comprising a plurality of slides, wherein the videoconferencing unit further comprises presentation engine for converting the slides into a corresponding set of thumbnail images. However, Craig teaches a system for providing a presentation of slides to a plurality of computers over a computer network, wherein each of the plurality of computers comprises graphical user interface for generating the slides into a corresponding set of thumbnail images (figure 2) in order to offer improved control and flexibility in the presentation of computer-based instructional sessions among widely distributed audiences. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ludwig and Venkatraman in having the presentation comprising a plurality of slides, wherein the videoconferencing unit further comprises presentation engine for converting the slides into a corresponding set of thumbnail images, as per teaching of Craig, in order to offer improved control and flexibility in the



presentation of computer-based instructional sessions among widely distributed audiences.

Regarding claims 14-15 and 20-21, the limitations of the claims are rejected as the same reasons set forth in claims 5-6.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 11-21-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejection of claims 2-4, 7-13, 16-19, and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being obvious over Ludwig et al. (US PAT: 5,617,539, hereinafter Ludwig) in view of Venkataraman et al. (US PAT: 5,956,487, hereinafter Venkataraman): regarding rejection of independent claims 2, 9, 10, 11, 18, 24, 25 using the above references, Applicant argues, in first paragraph of page 3 of his response office action rejection dated 7-21-2005, that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the references, and even if it were proper to combine the references, the combination still fails to every element of the claimed invention and further referring to Ludwig reference asserts that the addition of additional computing capabilities i.e., the embedded web server of Venkataraman to a videoconferencing unit is contrary to the teaching of Ludwig. In response to this argument by applicant, Examiner has to state that this interpretation of applicant for combining Ludwig and Venkataraman is the result of his own analysis and conclusion about the combination without any factual basis and nowhere examiner has stated that the combination of Venkataraman with Ludwig is to add computing capability to the computer disclosed in Ludwig. On the contrary, as stated in the office action

above, the combination of Ludwig with Venkataraman is to provide widely accessible and enhanced user interface functions for the device so that Ludwig system will be able to use this interface for executing additional function as taught by Venkataraman (col. 16-42).

Applicants further arguments against combination of Ludwig and Venkataraman is not persuasive for the same reasons as set forth above.

Regarding rejection of independent claim 2 using the above references, applicant further argues that "Neither Ludwig nor Venkataraman teaches embedded server that transmits a web page allowing a user "to select a file for broadcast" or view a file being transmitted by video conferencing unit". As examiner has conceded ... Examiner's assertion to the contrary is without merit. Because Ludwig and Venkataraman fail to teach or suggest this limitation of claim 2" . Contrary to applicants interpretation of the references, Venkataraman teaches the following: the network interface 12 (fig. 1) transfers the web page (18, fig. 1) to a requesting HTTP client via communication path (22, fig. 1, col. 3 lines 31-33). Venkataraman further teaches the following: the web page (18, fig. 1) may contain text, images, multimedia files, forms, tables or any object type supported by the HTTP and HTML protocols (col. 3 lines 40-43). Further Venkataraman teaches a monitor (16, fig. 1) to maintain the updated state information pertaining to the device (col. 3 lines 34-36). This clearly reads on applicant's claimed limitation such as "to select a file for broadcast" or view a file being transmitted". Therefore, Ludwig in combination with Venkataraman teaches the limitation: "to select a file for broadcast" or view a file being transmitted by video conferencing unit.

Regarding rejection of independent claim 9 using the combination of Ludwig and Venkataraman, Applicant argues that “claim 9 requires, among other things, “a web server embedded within the videoconferencing unit ... for transmitting a web page ... wherein the web page allows the user to perform diagnostic testing on the videoconferencing unit”. Ludwig and Venkataraman, separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest this limitation of claim 9”. Contrary to applicant’s interpretation of the references, Venkataraman teaches the following: The HTTP commands may be used by web clients to reads information from the dive (10, fig. 1) such as device status information. The HTTP commands may also be used to transfer information to the device (10) such as information that controls the functions or operating states of the device (10, col. 3 lines 19-26). Venkataraman further teaches the following: the web server (14, fig. 1) generates a web page (18, fig. 1) that defines a set of user interface functions for the device (10). The network interface (12, fig. 1) transfers the web page (18) to a requesting HTTP client via communication path (col. 3 lines 29-33). By this, Venkataraman clearly implies the following: a web server embedded within the unit ... for transmitting a web page ... wherein the web page allows the user to perform diagnostic testing (reads on controlling device and controlling operating states of the device) on the device. Therefore, Ludwig in combination with Venkataraman teaches the following: “a web server embedded within the videoconferencing unit ... for transmitting a web page ... wherein the web page allows the user to perform diagnostic testing on the videoconferencing unit”.

Regarding rejection of claim 10 using the combination of Ludwig and Venkataraman, Applicant argues that "claim 10 requires, among other things, "a web server embedded within the videoconferencing unit ... for transmitting a web page ... wherein the web page allows the user to modify configuration parameters of the videoconferencing unit". Ludwig and Venkataraman, separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest this limitation". Contrary to applicant's interpretation of the references, Venkataraman teaches the following: the web server (14, fig. 1) generates web page (18, fig. 1) dynamically to reflect updated state of the information pertaining to the device (10, fig. 1) that is maintained by monitor (16, fig. 1). The web page (18, fig. 1) may also define control buttons according to HTTP protocol that enable various control functions for the device (10) to be initiated from a web client via communication path (col. 3, lines 34-4). Venkataraman clearly implies "a web server embedded within the device... for transmitting a web page ... wherein the web page allows the user to modify configuration parameters (reads on changing the control functions of the device 10). Therefore Ludwig in combination with Venkataraman clearly imply the following: "a web server embedded within the videoconferencing unit ... for transmitting a web page ... wherein the web page allows the user to modify configuration parameters of the videoconferencing unit".

Regarding rejection of claims 11 and 18, the explanation provided for rejection of claim 2 holds good.

Applicants arguments regarding rejection of claims 5-6, 14-15, 20-21 are linked to independent claims being allowable which are not as explained above.

In light of this, rejection of claims 2-25 is maintained.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Melur Ramakrishnaiah  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2643